

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 13 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. By this Amendment, Claims 1-3 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0093] and [0094] of the published U.S. application. No new matter is added.

The Official Action rejects Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In particular, the Official Action takes the position that the wording in Claim 1 defining that the controlling section "initiates the reset operation" is not supported by the specification. Claim 1 is amended to recite that the controlling section executes the reset operation. Claims 2 and 3 are similarly amended. This feature is discussed in paragraphs [0093] and [0094] of the published U.S. application. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,279,685 to Ivansons et al. ("Ivansons") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,059,270 to Fleischmann et al. ("Fleischmann"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Official Action's interpretation of Ivansons, magnetic encoders 87, 107 determine the exact position of Ivansons' wafer carriage and tube holding arms at any given time (see column 10, lines 3-10 of Ivansons). The Official Action says that this information is stored in a non-volatile memory by the computer 146 (said to correspond to the claimed controlling section) to indicate if the device is in a connect or disconnect mode as discussed in lines 17-35 of column 11 of Ivansons. The Official Action takes the position that when power to Ivansons' device

is turned on, the computer 146 determines if the device was in the connecting mode based on the information stored in the computer 146. According to the Official Action, if the device was in the connecting state, the operator would be notified of an error via an LED indicator discussed in lines 28-38 of column 8 of Ivansons. In this regard, the Official Action appears to take the position that the LED indicator would naturally alert the operator that a reset operation is necessary.

However, as is clear from lines 21-32 of column 11 of the reference, Ivansons simply discloses that when a tube connection cycle is performed (i.e., during a connect operation), only the next cycle (i.e., the disconnect operation) is stored in the non-volatile memory, and vice versa. That is, the computer 146 simply alternates the cycles such that if the current cycle is the connect cycle, the next cycle is set as the disconnect cycle. Moreover, Ivansons discloses in lines 35-39 of column 10 that when the device is activated, the computer 146 clears interrupts, and reads the next cycle information that was saved in memory from the last successful cycle.

Ivansons' computer 146 is not programmed to judge, when power is supplied, that a reset operation is necessary when the information memorized in the computer 146 is information expressing that the device is in a connecting operation state, and does not restart a connecting operation to finish the connection operation.

Accordingly, Ivansons fails to disclose that the computer 146 is programmed to judge, when power is supplied, that a reset operation is necessary when the information memorized in the non-volatile memory is information expressing that the apparatus is in a connecting operation state, and that a connecting operation is *restarted to finish the connecting operation*, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Fleischmann fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ivansons, and is only cited by the Official Action to show that power is supplied to an electrode to heat the cutting

wafer. Thus, independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Ivansons and Fleischmann for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2, 3, 6-9 and 13 are patentable over Ivansons and Fleischmann at least by virtue of their dependence from patentable independent Claim 1. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ivansons in view of Fleischmann, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,979 to Sano et al. ("Sano"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 is patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of its dependence from patentable independent Claim 1. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in this dependent claim is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 17, 2009

By: /David R. Kemeny/
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

David R. Kemeny
Registration No. 57241

Customer No. 21839
(703) 836-6620